

are enclosed for the Examiner's convenience. Thus, Claims 20-58 are not pending in the present application.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has grouped these Claims into different inventions as follows: (1) Claims 1-10 corresponding to Invention I; (2) Claims 11-15 corresponding to Invention II; and (3) Claims 16-19 corresponding to Invention III.

The Examiner concluded that structural differences among Invention I (corresponding to Claims 1-10), Invention II (corresponding to Claims 11-15), and Invention III (corresponding to Claims 16-19) warrant restriction of those Inventions. In particular, the Examiner points to the slot included in Invention II and the spring included in Invention III as structural differences between those Inventions and Invention I. The Examiner stated that Invention I was classified in Class 604, Subclass 192, but that Inventions II and III were respectively classified in Subclasses 110 and 198 of Class 604. Thus, the Examiner concluded that restriction of Inventions I-III was proper.

Applicant notes, however, that the structural features relied on by the Examiner in issuing the Restriction Requirement are respectively recited in dependent Claims 4 and 8, which depend from independent Claim 1 and fall within the Examiner's definition of Invention I. Thus, since the structural features relied on by the Examiner to characterize Inventions II and III as being respectively distinct from provisionally elected Invention I are in fact included within the definition of Invention I, Applicant believes that the Examiner's field of search for Invention I would necessarily encompass those structural

features. Accordingly, Applicant believes that examination of Claims 1-19 would not place an undue burden on the Examiner, and that the Restriction Requirement is thus improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Restriction Requirement.

Conclusion

Claims 20-58 were cancelled in a Preliminary Amendment filed by Applicant on June 8, 2001, and thus are not pending in the present application. Pending Claims 1-19 correspond to Inventions I-III as identified by the Examiner. Inventions I-III should not be restricted in view of the fact that the Examiner's field of search for Invention I would necessarily encompass those structural features that the Examiner relied on to characterize Inventions II and III as being respectively distinct from provisionally elected Invention I. Accordingly, examination of Claims 1-19 would not be unduly burdensome for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted

AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP
Attorneys for Applicant
90 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016
(212) 336-8000

Dated: New York, New York
August 10, 2004

By: Marion P. Metelski
Marion P. Metelski
Registration No.: 38,557